



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,686	09/23/2003	Larry B. Pearson	1033-SS00414	1039
84326	7590	11/29/2011	EXAMINER	
AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Toler			SAMS, MATTHEW C	
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING				
ROOM 2A-207			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ONE AT & T WAY				2617
BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,686	PEARSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW SAMS	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 43,44,54-57,61-68,88,90 and 91 is/are pending in the application.
 - 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 43,44,54-57,61-68,88,90 and 91 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 9/22/2011.
2. Claims 43, 54-56, 61, 63-65, 67, 68 and 88 have been amended.
3. Claims 58, 59 and 89 have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. Applicant's argument regarding amended claim 88 is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
6. With respect to the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 43-44 and 90-91, Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection and the newly cited/applied portions of Appelman.
7. With respect to the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 54-57 and Gross, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's claim states "after the subscriber answers the second call, the call direction control system prompt the subscriber to select an action comprising one of answering the first call, routing the first call to voice mail, and routing the first call to an electronic mail address of the subscriber" (*note*: only one of these options needs to be satisfied). Gross states the "ARU" (equivalent to the call direction control system) puts a caller on hold and places the outbound call (the second call) and gives the callee the

option to accept or refuse the call. (Col. 16 lines 31-37) This meets the Applicant's claim limitations.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 61 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection and the newly cited/applied portions of Appelman.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 62-68 are moot in view of the responses above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 43, 44, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor (US-7,006,833) in view of Appelman (US-7,031,698), Wilhoite (US-2003/0224795 hereinafter, Wilhoite) and Aoki et al. (US-2003/0161099 hereinafter, Aoki).

Regarding claim 43, Contractor teaches a system for manipulating call redirection (Abstract and Col. 1 line 51 through Col. 2 line 40), the system comprising:

a proximity zone database (Fig. 3 [114 & 116]) storing proximity zone data received from one or more of a mobile telephone of a subscriber and a computing device associated with the subscriber; (Fig. 4 [407-408] and Col. 9 lines 33-44) and

a call direction control system (Fig. 3 [114]) coupled to the proximity zone database (Fig. 3 [116]) to redirect calls directed to a primary destination address (Col. 9 lines 12-14) of the subscriber (Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 6 and Fig. 4B [410] *note*: the Examiner does not see a difference in functionality with respect to "place a second call" until the limitations in claim 54 actually differentiate the need to "place a second call" instead of just forwarding/redirecting the first call):

to a first selected address when the proximity zone data indicates that the subscriber is in the first proximity zone (Col. 7 lines 57-67), wherein the first selected address is a telephone number of a device in the first proximity zone; (Col. 7 line 64 and Col. 9 lines 54-65)

to a second selected address when the proximity zone data indicates that the subscriber is in the second proximity zone (Col. 7 line 38 through Col. 8 line 9), wherein the second selected address is an email address associated with the second proximity zone; (Col. 7 line 64) and

to a third selected address when each of the plurality of proximity zone sensors indicates that the proximity indicator is not detected within the proximity zone associated with the respective proximity sensor (Col. 10 lines 6-10), wherein the third selected address is associated with a mobile communication device of the subscriber. (Col. 10 lines 10-13)

Contractor differs from the claimed invention by utilizing "proximity sensors" instead of a cradle that is coupled with a computing device, with the cradles requiring

electrical contact with the mobile communication device of the subscriber to determine proximity information.

In an analogous art, Appelman teaches a method and system for communicating forwarding information based on the device being physically detected at a location (Abstract) that includes using a cradle that electrically contacts the mobile communication device (Fig. 1 [112 & 112a]) and communicates a redirection message through a computing device. (Col. 2 lines 32-49, Col. 4 lines 44-67, Col. 6 lines 13-33 and lines 53-67 *note*: the Examiner views the docking cradle that can communicate with an IP network to incorporate the computing device and the computing device logic)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the location based call forwarding system of Contractor after modifying it to incorporate the use of a cradle for detecting and triggering location based call forwarding of Appelman since cradles are well known devices that are typically used for storage/recharging a battery and are typically placed in locations where a user spends large amounts of time (*i.e.* located at home and at work).

Contractor in view of Appelman differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting determining the proximity zone data from the mobile telephone indicates that the mobile telephone is in communication with a wireless network access point.

In an analogous art, Wilhoite teaches a proximity based call forwarding and transferring system (Abstract and Page 2 [0013]) that includes determining proximity zone data of a subscriber from their mobile telephone based on whether they are in

communication with wireless network access points associated with specific proximity zones. (Page 3 [0023], Page 4 [0040] “When the signaling center 12 receives a message from an IP antenna that an identified subscriber mobile phone is in good communication with the IP antenna” *note*: an IP antenna + router = a wireless network access point, specially since it is provided access to the Internet, Page 5 [0048], Fig. 1 [14, 16 & 105], Pages 4-5 [0042] and Page 6 [0050 & 0055-0057])

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Appelman after modifying it to incorporate the use of wireless network access points instead of proximity sensors of Wilhoite since wireless network access points not only provide proximity detection (Page 3 [0023] and Pages 4-5 [0042]) but also provide access to the Internet. (Fig. 1 [105] and Page 2 [0013])

Contractor in view of Appelman and Wilhoite teaches that personal computers can be connected to the delivery network and receive VoIP calls (Appelman Col. 4 lines 2-8), but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the computing device is external to the charging device, wherein the computing device is coupled to the charging device via a universal serial bus (USB) connection.

In an analogous art, Aoki teaches a cradle (Fig. 2 [9]) that is external to the computing device, that includes a USB cable (Fig. 2 [92]) for connecting to a personal computer (Page 1 [0009]) and includes the ability to charge a battery (Page 1 [0009] and Page 2 [0035]) of a connected portable information terminal. (Fig. 1 [8])

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the ability to trigger the forwarding of telephone calls based on placement within a docking station of Contractor in view of Appelman and Wilhoite after modifying it to incorporate the ability to charge devices connected to a docking station through a USB cable interface connected to a computing device of Aoki since the USB interface has been universally integrated into personal computers, thereby providing a charging convenience and data sharing compatibility between many devices, while separating the computing device functionality from the docking station of Appelman makes the docking station cheaper for consumer purchase, without losing any functionality when connected to a personal computer.

Regarding claim 44, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite and Aoki teaches the proximity zone is a home proximity zone associated with a home of the subscriber (Contractor Col. 11 lines 14-30) or a work proximity zone associated with a work place of the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 11 lines 31-33)

Regarding claims 90 and 91, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite and Aoki teaches the particular wireless network access point is an 802.11 wireless network access point or a Bluetooth access point. (Wilhoite Page 5 [0048] “Bluetooth and 802.11”)

12. Claims 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite and Aoki as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Gross et al. (US-6,389,117 hereafter, Gross)

Regarding claim 54, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite and Aoki teaches redirecting a call to the mobile telephone number of the mobile of the subscriber (Contractor Col. 3 lines 35-38 & Col. 9 lines 12-14) based on the user location (Contractor Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 6 *i.e.* proximity zone data), the call direction control system receives the call. (Contractor Fig. 4A [403]), but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting after the subscriber answers the second call, the call direction control system prompts the subscriber to select an action comprising one of answering the first call, routing the first call to voice mail, and routing the first call to an electronic mail address of the subscriber.

In an analogous art, Gross teaches a system and method of using a single telephone number to access multiple communication services that includes receiving a call, placing a second call to the selected address (Col. 16 lines 33-34) and prompting the subscriber to select an action to be taken with respect to the call after the subscriber answers the second call, including answering the first call. (Col. 16 lines 16-37 and Fig. 8)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite and Aoki after modifying it to incorporate a user menu for call action/inaction of Gross. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since even if a subscriber is using location based routing, a subscriber might find it temporarily inconvenient to always answer the phone.

Regarding claim 55, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite, Aoki and Gross teaches connecting the first call and the second call to allow the caller to engage in a conversation with the subscriber if the selected action indicates to forward the call. (Gross Col. 16 lines 16-37)

Regarding claim 56, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite, Aoki and Gross teaches after receiving the first call, the call direction control system prompts a caller to provide the caller's name and stores a data record including the caller's name. (Gross Col. 16 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 57, Contractor in view of Appelman, Wilhoite, Aoki and Gross teaches after placing the second call, the call direction control system accesses the data record including the caller's name and plays an announcement to the subscriber that includes the caller's name before prompting the subscriber to select the action. (Gross Col. 16 lines 33-37)

13. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross.

Regarding claim 61, Contractor teaches a method of processing a call (Abstract and Col. 1 line 51 through Col. 2 line 40), the method comprising:

a proximity zone database (Fig. 3 [114 & 116]) determining proximity zone data of a subscriber based on a call redirection message received from one of a plurality of computing devices associated with the subscriber; (Fig. 4 [407-408] and Col. 9 lines 33-44) and

storing proximity zone data; (Fig. 4 [407-408] and Col. 9 lines 33-44) and

redirecting calls directed to a mobile telephone number of a mobile telephone associated with the subscriber based on the call redirection message, (Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 6 and Fig. 4B [410])

wherein the call redirection message indicates that the calls directed to the mobile telephone number are to be redirected to:

to a first telephone number of a first telephone device within the first proximity zone when the proximity zone data indicates that the mobile telephone and the subscriber are in the first proximity zone; (Col. 2 lines 1-11, Col. 7 lines 57-67, specifically line 64 “telephone number” and Col. 9 lines 54-65)

to a second telephone number (Col. 7 lines 62-67) of a second telephone device within the second proximity zone when the proximity zone data indicates that the mobile telephone and the subscriber are in the second proximity zone. (Col. 2 lines 1-11, Col. 7 line 38 through Col. 8 line 9)

Contractor differs from the claimed invention by utilizing “proximity sensors” instead of a cradle that is coupled with a computing device, with the cradles requiring electrical contact with the mobile communication device of the subscriber to determine proximity information.

In an analogous art, Appelman teaches a method and system for communicating forwarding information based on the device being physically detected at a location (Abstract) that includes using a cradle that electrically contacts the mobile communication device (Fig. 1 [112 & 112a]) and communicates a redirection message through a computing device. (Col. 1 lines 34-45 *i.e.* canceling call forwarding, Col. 2

lines 32-49, Col. 4 lines 44-67, Col. 6 lines 13-33 and lines 53-67 *note:* the Examiner views the docking cradle that can communicate with an IP network to incorporate the computing device and the computing device logic)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the location based call forwarding system of Contractor after modifying it to incorporate the use of a cradle for detecting and triggering location based call forwarding of Appelman since cradles are well known devices that are typically used for storage/recharging a battery and are typically placed in locations where a user spends large amounts of time (*i.e.* located at home and at work). (Appelman Col. 6 lines 13-23)

Contractor in view of Appelman teaches the computing device is coupled to a network via a network access point (Appelman Col. 3 line 60 through Col. 4 line 36 “LAN” & “WAN”), but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the computing device is external to the charging device.

In an analogous art, Aoki teaches a cradle (Fig. 2 [9]) that is external to the computing device, that includes a USB cable (Fig. 2 [92]) for connecting to a personal computer (Page 1 [0009]) and includes the ability to charge a battery (Page 1 [0009] and Page 2 [0035]) of a connected portable information terminal. (Fig. 1 [8])

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the ability to trigger the forwarding of telephone calls based on placement within a docking station of Contractor in view of Appelman after modifying it to incorporate the ability separate the charging device from

the computing device of Aoki since separating the computing device functionality from the docking station makes the docking station cheaper for consumer purchase, without losing any functionality when connected to a personal computer.

Contractor in view of Appelman and Aoki differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting after the subscriber answers the second call, the call direction control system prompts the subscriber to select an action comprising one of answering the first call, routing the first call to voice mail, and routing the first call to an electronic mail address of the subscriber.

In an analogous art, Gross teaches a system and method of using a single telephone number to access multiple communication services that includes receiving a call, placing a second call to the selected address (Col. 16 lines 33-34) and prompting the subscriber to select an action to be taken with respect to the call after the subscriber answers the second call, including answering the first call. (Col. 16 lines 16-37 and Fig. 8)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Appelman and Aoki after modifying it to incorporate a user menu for call action/inaction of Gross. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since even if a subscriber is using location based routing, a subscriber might find it temporarily inconvenient to always answer the phone.

14. Claims 62, 63 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross as applied to claim 61 above, and further in view of Trioano et al. (US-2006/0136546 hereinafter, Trioano).

Regarding claim 62, 63, 65 and 67, Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross teaches the limitations of claim 61 above, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the use of an application layer communication protocol, a Remote Procedure Call, a Simple Object Access Protocol message or HTTP.

In an analogous art, Trioano teaches a triggering system to initiate communications in a mobile network (Abstract) that includes the use of SOAP messaging (Page 5 [0065]), which inherently is an application layer communication and relies heavily upon Remote Procedure Call and HTTP for implementation. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross after modifying it to incorporate the use of SOAP as a triggering message of Trioano since it is based on XML and is a lightweight protocol for communication between web services in computer networks.

Regarding claim 66, Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki, Gross and Trioano teaches the use of electronic mail message. (Trioano Page 2 [0015 & 0018])

15. Claims 64 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross as applied to claim 61 above, and further in view of Khan et al. (US-2002/0165988 hereinafter, Khan).

Regarding claim 64, Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross teaches the limitations of claim 61 above, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the use of InterProcess Communication messages.

In an analogous art, Khan teaches a mechanism for retrieving network content that includes using Interprocessor communications. (Page 15 [0175]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki and Gross after modifying it to incorporate the Interprocessor communication messaging of Khan since it enables easy communication between server applications.

Regarding claim 68, Contractor in view of Appelman, Aoki, Gross and Khan teaches the use of file transfer protocol messages. (Khan Page 16 [0182-0183])

16. Claim 88 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman (US-7,031,698) in view of Aoki et al. (US-2003/0161099 hereinafter, Aoki) and Gross.

Regarding claim 88, Appelman teaches a method comprising:
at a computing device associated with a subscriber (Col. 6 lines 53-67 *note*: the Examiner views the docking cradle that can communicate with an IP network to incorporate the computing device and the computing device logic), detecting that a mobile telephone associated with the subscriber is in electrical contact with a charging device coupled to the computing device (Col. 2 lines 32-49, Col. 4 lines 44-67 and Col. 5 lines 22-58) and wherein the computing device is coupled to a network via a network access point; (Col. 3 line 60 through Col. 4 line 36 “LAN” & “WAN”)

sending a first call redirection message from the computing device to a call redirection service (Col. 5 line 64 through Col. 6 line 40 and Col. 6 lines 53-67), wherein the first call redirection message indicates that a first call directed to a mobile telephone number of the mobile telephone is to be redirected to a telephone number of a telephone device within a proximity zone associated with the computing device; (Col. 6 lines 25-34)

detecting that the mobile telephone is no longer in electrical contact with the charging device coupled to the computing device; (Col. 5 lines 22-53) and

sending a second call redirection message from the computing device to the call redirection service, wherein the second call redirection message cancels the redirection of calls to the telephone number. (Col. 2 lines 32-49, Col. 7 lines 1-8, Col. 8 lines 33-37 and lines 51-55)

Appelman teaches that personal computers can be connected to the delivery network and receive VoIP calls (Col. 4 lines 2-8), but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the computing device is external to the charging device, wherein the computing device is coupled to the charging device via a universal serial bus (USB) connection.

In an analogous art, Aoki teaches a cradle (Fig. 2 [9]) that is external to the computing device, that includes a USB cable (Fig. 2 [92]) for connecting to a personal computer (Page 1 [0009]) and includes the ability to charge a battery (Page 1 [0009] and Page 2 [0035]) of a connected portable information terminal. (Fig. 1 [8])

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the ability to trigger the forwarding of telephone calls based on placement within a docking station of Appelman after modifying it to incorporate the ability to charge devices connected to a docking station through a USB cable interface connected to a computing device of Aoki since the USB interface has been universally integrated into personal computers, thereby providing a charging convenience and data sharing compatibility between many devices, while separating the computing device functionality from the docking station of Appelman makes the docking station cheaper for consumer purchase, without losing any functionality when connected to a personal computer.

Appelman in view of Aoki teaches redirecting a call but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting placing a second call for redirecting.

In an analogous art, Gross teaches a system and method of using a single telephone number to access multiple communication services that includes receiving a call and placing a second call to the selected address (Col. 16 lines 16-37, specifically lines 33-34 and Fig. 8)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Appelman in view of Aoki after modifying it to incorporate placing a second call to a telephone number for call redirection of Gross. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since this is a simple substitution of how a call is being forwarded to a different number, with a predictable result.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW SAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MATTHEW SAMS/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617